(34)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 3730 of 2007

PETITIONER	1)	Laxmi Prasad Tamrakar, aged about 30 years, S/o. Shri Ashok Tamrakar, R/o. Main Road, Lormi, Dist. Bilaspur, CG.
	2)	Krishna Kumar Tamrakar, aged about 32 years, S/o. Shri Ashok Tamrakar, R/o. Main Road, Lormi, Dist. Bilaspur, CG.

Versus

RESPONDENTS	1)	Secretary, R.T.A. Bilaspur, CG (Bilaspur Region).
	2)	M/s. Raipur Bus Service, G.E. Road, Gajpara, Durg, CG.
	3)	Regional Transport Authority, Raipur, CG.
	4)	STAT, Raipur, CG.

(Writ Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India)

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri

Present: Shri Santosh Gupta, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Sumesh Bajaj, Govt. Advocate for the State.

ORDER
(Passed on 2nd July, 2007)

The petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 15-5-2007 (Annexure P/7) filed by the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, in Revision No. 82/2007.

2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the Regional Transport Authority, while granting temporary permit to the respondent No.2 on the route of Lormi to Mungeli via Kanteli and Devri, has not considered the fact that time difference between ~~under~~ the permit granted to the petitioners and that of to the respondent No.2 on the same route is only fifteen minutes. Thus, the petitioners would suffer loss.

35

3) On perusal of the pleadings and the document appended thereto, it appears that the temporary permit was granted for a period of three months from 1-4-2007 to 31-7-2007. Two months have already been over and remaining period is less than one month. Secondly, it appears that the objections of the petitioners were considered and looking into the requirement of the route in order to meet the need of festivals during that period, a permit was granted.

4) In view of the foregoing, there is no point in going into the validity of the permit at this stage and the petitioners are at liberty to raise the objection when either the period of temporary permit granted to the respondent No.2 is extended or new permit is granted on the said route. Looking from all angles, there is no irregularity or infirmity in the impugned order. Thus, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

raju